## Shell

Counterplan Text – Rehabilitation ought to be valued above retribution in the United States criminal justice system, outside of California. California inmates will be sent to college.

Any permutation violates “in the… criminal justice system.”

Sending prisoners to receive a college education saves California billions of dollars. **Mayeux 10**[[1]](#footnote-1)

The irony, of course, or maybe this was just the point all along, is that Hutchison was right: Hundreds of thousands of would-be college students have been denied access to higher education because of money spent on prisoners, but not because prisoners have been sucking up all the college grants. **In many states prisons** now **receive** far **more gov**ernment **funding than colleges and universities** do — even though all that government funding mostly goes **to keeping prisoners idle.** As California struggles to keep not just its once-legendary state university system but also the state itself afloat, it’s worth noting, **a**s **UCLA professor** Chan Noriega recently **calculated, that “California could send every last prisoner to a UC campus, covering all expenses, and** still **save** nearly **$2.3 billion per year.”**

## Biodiversity NB

California budget crisis is killing state parks now. **CTTC 11**[[2]](#footnote-2)

**The prospect of California State Park closures is** again **in the news as** the State of **California deals with its** continuing **budget crisis.** There are, however, private alternatives that should be considered before closing the parks. Increased public funding of the parks just isn’t an option. **The failure of Prop**osition **21** last November **made** that **clear**. By soundly defeating the proposition, voters declared their **opposition to increasing taxes to maintain state parks** as they are today**.** Countless surveys and actual park use demonstrate that while **Californians** love their state parks, they also **want them managed with**in **available resources.**The State of California has exhausted the governmental solutions to the dilemma. And so, California State Parks have no alternatives other than to close parks or find non-governmental funding solutions to sustain them. In the past, privately funded solutions have been dismissed out of hand. Though today, no solution that would keep our state park system viable should be discarded. So, let’s consider these alternatives:

California state parks are key to strong biodiversity hotspots. **Hart et al. 13**[[3]](#footnote-3)

A single California valley might contain several microclimates. In the fog belt it might be drizzly and misty all day long, even while a mile or two away the sun is shining in the banana belt. When comparing networks of valleys, California sees just as much diversity. Redwood groves meet grassland meadows, snowy mountains fall to desert floors, and temperate belts facilitate year-round agriculture. This is one of the reasons **California is teeming with** tall trees and diverse and plentiful ocean life. It’s a state full of **biodiversity hotspots**—areas where microclimates and evolution have fostered pockets of rare plants and animals. Yet microclimates are sensitive to changes in temperature and precipitation. Small climate changes have a big impact. This is one of the reasons hotspots will suffer as climate change continues. There is growing conviction among conservation biologists that greater biodiversity also confers greater resilience within ecosystems. Resilience refers to the ability of an ecosystem to maintain its functions in the face of disturbance. A climate resilient ecosystem would retain its functions and ecosystem services in the face of climate change. In fact, **state parks in California** represent the “hottest of hotspots” by **protect**ing **ever more endangered plant and animal species.** By preserving these ecosystems, we help address climate change. In addition, **parks create buffers around hotspots.** By providing **open space zones around critical habitats**, resiliency is increased. These buffers **assist ecosystems** in their struggle **to maintain balance.** Preservation not only makes biodiversity hotspots more resilient to change, but buffers provide plants and animals with space to expand and shift. **California State Parks also connect habitats, providing opportunities for displaced species to relocate.** In light of climate change, many species are beginning to seek higher elevation habitats where precipitation and temperature now mimic the climate in lower region**. As species move, they will need protected corridors** to migrate. Climate change poses a particular threat to existing wildlife corridors. Businesses and homes may have to move, posing new development threats to open spaces. By connecting high elevation hills to the beach, and linking valleys together, parks preserve corridors from development.

Biodiversity hotspots are key to global biodiversity.

**Conservation International 13**[[4]](#footnote-4)

Life on Earth faces a crisis of historical and planetary proportions. Unsustainable consumption in many northern countries and crushing poverty in the tropics are destroying wild nature. Biodiversity is besieged. Extinction is the gravest aspect of the biodiversity crisis: it is irreversible. While extinction is a natural process, human impacts have elevated the rate of extinction by at least a thousand, possibly several thousand, times the natural rate. Mass extinctions of this magnitude have only occurred five times in the history of our planet; the last brought the end of the dinosaur age. **In a world where conservation budgets are insufficient given the number of species threatened with extinction, identifying conservation priorities is crucial.** British ecologist Norman Myers defined **the biodiversity hotspot concept** in 1988 to **address[es]** the dilemma that conservationists face: **what areas are** the **most** immediately **important for conserving biodiversity**? The biodiversity hotspots hold especially high numbers of endemic species, yet their combined area of remaining habitat covers only 2.3 percent of the Earth's land surface. Each hotspot faces extreme threats and has already lost at least 70 percent of its original natural vegetation. **Over 50 percent of the world’s plant species and 42 percent of** all **terrestrial vertebrate species are endemic to** the 34 **biodiversity hotspots.**

Biodiversity loss causes extinction. **Diner 94**[[5]](#footnote-5)

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems are inherently more stable than less diverse systems: "**'The more complex the ecosystem, the more** successfully **it can resist** a **stress.**..[l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." By causing widespread extinctions humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. **As biological simplicity rises, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara desert in Africa, and the dustbowl** conditions **of** the 1930s in **the U.S. are** relatively **mild examples** of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, **each new** animal or plant **extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse, and human extinction.** Certainly, each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

Biodiversity loss causes nuclear war. **Takacs 96**[[6]](#footnote-6)

So **biodiversity keeps the world running.** It has value and of itself, as well as for us. Raven, Erwin, and Wilson oblige us to think about the value of biodiversity for our own lives. The Ehrlichs’ rivet-popper trope makes this same point; by eliminating rivets, we play Russian roulette with global ecology and human futures: “It is likely that **destruction of** the rich complex of **species in the Amazon** basin **could trigger rapid changes in global climate** patterns. Agriculture remains heavily dependent on stable climate, and human beings remain heavily dependent on food. By the end of the century the extinction of perhaps a million species in the Amazon basin could have entrained famines in which a billion human beings perished. And if our species is very unlucky, the **famines could lead to** a thermo**nuclear war**, which could extinguish civilization.” 13 Elsewhere Ehrlich uses different particulars with no less drama: What then will happen if the current decimation of organic diversity continues? **Crop yields will be more difficult to maintain** in the face of climatic change, soil erosion, loss of dependable water supplies, decline of pollinators, and ever more serious assaults by pests. **Conversion of productive land to wasteland will accelerate**; deserts will continue their seemingly inexorable expansion. **Air pollution will increase**, and local climates will become harsher. Humanity will have to forgo many of the direct economic benefits it might have withdrawn from Earth's well­stocked genetic library. It might, for example, miss out on a cure for cancer; but that will make little difference. As ecosystem services falter, **mortality from** respiratory and epidemic **disease,** natural **disasters, and** especially **famine will lower life expectancies** to the point where can­cer (largely a disease of the elderly) will be unimportant. **Humanity will bring** up**on itself consequences** depressingly **similar to** those expected from **a nuclear winter.** Barring a nuclear conflict, it appears that civili­zation will disappear some time before the end of the next century - not with a bang but a whimper.

## Econ NB

California budget crisis kills the US economy. **Matthews 9**[[7]](#footnote-7)

The **California budget crisis could have national implications. Of all the states, California has the biggest econ**omy and it also has the biggest budget crisis. What that means to the rest of the country is just now beginning to sink in. STORY: Governor declares new state of emergency Earlier this year, Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner suggested the Federal government was willing to lend a hand to California, but two weeks ago the president's spokesman said no. "We'll continue to monitor the challenges that they have, but this budgetary problem unfortunately is one that they're going to have to solve," says White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs. Tuesday Senator Barbara Boxer, D-Calif., said stimulus money is coming but some of it will depend on California having a budget. "And we are assuming that the state will get its act together because under the Constitution it must get its act together," says Sen. Boxer. But the state hasn't yet and **the question being asked in Washington can the U.S. economy recover without California.**

US is key to the global economy. **Caploe 9**[[8]](#footnote-8)

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that **the global economy has** in fact **been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years**. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, **this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy** - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - **has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression**. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that **there is no other engine for the world economy** - and hasn't been for the last six decades. **If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen**. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies. Team Obama seems reluctant to acknowledge the extent to which its policies at home are failing not just there but around the world as well. Which raises the question: If the US can't or won't or doesn't want to be the global economic engine, which country will? The obvious answer is China. But that is unrealistic for three reasons. First, **China's economic health is** more **tied to America's** than practically any other country in the world. Indeed, the reason China has so many dollars to invest everywhere - whether in US Treasury bonds or in Africa - is precisely that it has structured its own economy to complement America's. **The only way China can serve as the engine of the global economy is if the US starts pulling it first**. Second, the US-centred system began at a time when its domestic demand far outstripped that of the rest of the world. The fundamental source of its economic power is its ability to act as the global consumer of last resort. China, however, is a poor country, with low per capita income, even though it will soon pass Japan as the world's second largest economy. There are real possibilities for growth in China's domestic demand. But given its structure as an export-oriented economy, it is doubtful if even a successful Chinese stimulus plan can pull the rest of the world along unless and until China can start selling again to the US on a massive scale. Finally, the key 'system' issue for China - or for the European Union - in thinking about becoming the engine of the world economy - is monetary: What are the implications of having your domestic currency become the global reserve currency? This is an extremely complex issue that the US has struggled with, not always successfully, from 1959 to the present. Without going into detail, it can safely be said that though having the US dollar as the world's medium of exchange has given the US some tremendous advantages, it has also created huge problems, both for America and the global economic system. The Chinese leadership is certainly familiar with this history. It will try to avoid the yuan becoming an international medium of exchange until it feels much more confident in its ability to handle the manifold currency problems that the US has grappled with for decades. Given all this, **the US will remain the engine of global economic recovery for the foreseeable future**, even though other countries must certainly help. This crisis began in the US - and it is going to have to be solved there too.

Economic crisis causes nuclear war–strong statistical support. **Royal 10**[[9]](#footnote-9)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances **Modelski and Thompson**’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, **find**ing **that rhythms in the global economy are associated with** the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often **bloody transition from one** pre-eminent **leader to the next.** As such, exogenous **shocks** such as economic crises could **usher in a redistribution of** relative **power** (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, **increasing** the risk of **miscalculation** (Fearon 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflicts as **a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power** (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remains unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggest that “future expectation of trade” is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if** the **expectations of future trade decline**, particularly for difficult to replace item such as energy resources, the likelihood for **conflict increases**, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg and Hess, 2002, p. 89) Economic **decline has also been linked with** an increase in the likelihood of **terrorism** (Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, **crises** generally **reduce the popularity of a sitting government.** “Diversionary theory” suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting **governments have** increased **incentive**s **to fabricate** external military **conflict**s **to create a “rally around the flag” effect**. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995) and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states due to the fact the democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. De DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States and thus weak Presidential popularity are statically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

## AT Surplus Now

The “budget surplus” is a farce. It’s not money that can be put into California state parks. **Halper 2/18**[[10]](#footnote-10)

SACRAMENTO -- The surge of revenue that showed up unexpectedly in state coffers last month has been the source of all manner of speculation here. When all the tax receipts were counted, **the state** had **collected more than $5 billion beyond what had been initially projected for January.** That is more tax dollars than are allocated to the entire state university system in a year. The revenue bump was historic. **The question** for budget experts **was whether the windfall was real money that lawmakers could begin allocating toward** government **programs** and tax breaks **-- or** whether it amounted to **an accounting anomaly that would be offset by a huge dip in revenue later** in the budget year**.** **Gov.** Jerry **Brown’s budget office** now **advises** in an official cash report **that it is probably the latter.** Lawmakers need not do very much reading between the lines to realize that **Brown does not see the surge as occasion to pack the budget with extra spending.** The report says the extra revenue was "likely the result of major tax law changes at the federal and state level having a significant impact in the timing of revenue receipts.” That is, taxpayers are paying a big share of their bill early, getting income off their books in the hope of limiting exposure to the tax hikes that recently kicked in. The administration was expecting that money to arrive in April. Now it is saying it won’t and that just as January’s receipts soared, Californians can expect them to be offset by a big plunge in the spring.
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